

Remarks/arguments

In the non-final Office Action dated November 29, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention and because claim 1 recites the broad recitation together with the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claims 2-11 were also rejected because they are dependent on claim 1.

The amended claims as now presented are believed to be in the allowable condition.

We have amended the claim 1. In the amended form of claim 1 we have deleted the phrase "independent from it's origin, i.e. whether the interference is orthogonal or non-orthogonal relatively to the useful signal". We've also added in the amended claim 1 the phrase "Bit Error Rate" as definition of the acronym "BER".

January 17, 2008



Hakobyan, Razmik

Inventor.